

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-7, and 9-18 were pending and presented for examination in this application. In an Office Action dated August 2, 2007 claims 1-3, 5-7, and 9-15 were rejected. Applicants address the Examiner's comments below. Applicants are amending claims 1-2 and 14 in this Amendment and Response. Applicants are canceling claims 4-8, 10-13, and 16-18 and adding new claims 19-24. In view of the Amendments herein and the Remarks that follow, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and withdraw them.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)

In the 7th-17th paragraphs of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-13 and 15 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,567,800 B1 to Barrera ("Barrera") and U.S. Patent No. 6,704,729 to Klein, et al. ("Klein"). The Examiner further rejects claim 14 as allegedly being unpatentable in view of Barrera, Klein, and Official Notice. This rejection is now traversed.

Claim 1, as amended, recites in part:

...responsive to determining that the query matches the subject category identifier in the exact match table, retrieving a first content module referenced by a tree node associated with the subject category identifier from the exact match table, and **traversing the data tree hierarchy from the matching node associated with the exact matching subject category identifier to a child node** to retrieve a second content module comprising more specific content than the first content module;

responsive to determining that the query does not match any subject category identifiers in the exact match table, determining if an alternative match exists between the query and an alternative subject category identifier in an alternative match table;

responsive to determining that the query matches the alternative subject category identifier in the alternative match table, retrieving a first content module referenced by a tree node associated with the

alternative matching subject category identifier, and **traversing the data tree hierarchy from the matching node associated with the alternative matching subject category identifier to a parent node** to retrieve a second content module, wherein the second content module comprises more general content than the first content module;

The claimed invention would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention because Barrera and Klein taken either alone or in combination fail to disclose or suggest

“...responsive to determining that the query matches the subject category identifier in the exact match table...traversing the data tree hierarchy from the matching node associated with the exact matching subject category identifier to a child node...”

and

“responsive to determining that the query matches the alternative subject category identifier in the alternative match table...traversing the data tree hierarchy from the matching node associated with the alternative matching subject category identifier to a parent node...”

Barrera discloses searching information stored on a network. A category selection is first received from a user (FIG. 1, step 304) and a content search request is then received to search content of the web pages corresponding to the selected category. (FIG. 1, step 305, col. 5 lines 33-35). As the Examiner admits, Barrera fails to disclose “a data tree hierarchy having a plurality of tree nodes, wherein each tree node comprises a pointer to a content module and each node is associated with a subject category identifier.”

The Examiner instead points to Klein as disclosing a hierarchical taxonomy that allows for traversal of related nodes within the hierarchy. Klein discloses identifying a “seed category” based on a user query and determining if the category meets a relevancy threshold. Additional categories are then retrieved from the tree by traversing through the tree from the seed node. (Klein, col. 10, lines 34-46, FIG. 5). However, Klein does not disclose or suggest “...responsive to determining that the query matches the subject category identifier in the

exact match table...traversing the data tree hierarchy from the matching node associated with the exact matching subject category identifier to a child node...”and “responsive to determining that the query matches the alternative subject category identifier in the alternative match table...traversing the data tree hierarchy from the matching node associated with the alternative matching subject category identifier to a parent node...”

Rather, if a relevancy threshold is exceeded, Klein “builds a cluster of ancestor and descendent categories around the seed category.” (Klein, col. 10 lines 38-40). If the seed node is below the relevancy threshold, Klein does not display the seed node or “clustered relatives” at all (FIG. 5, 504, 505).

In the rejection to dependent claim 13, the Examiner references col. 8 lines 47-55 as allegedly disclosing the claimed limitation. However, the process described in the cited section merely describes a scoring system used for selecting the “seed category”, or matching node. Klein discloses, for example, that a matching score for a particular category depends, in part, on its ancestors and descendents in the tree structure. The process is unrelated to retrieving content modules for display once the matching node (or “seed category” in Klein) is determined.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as amended, is patentably distinguishable over the applied references.

Claim 19, as amended, also recites:

“...responsive to determining that the query matches the subject category identifier in the exact match table...traversing the data tree hierarchy from the matching node associated with the exact matching subject category identifier to a child node...”

and

“responsive to determining that the query matches the alternative subject category identifier in the alternative match table...traversing the data tree hierarchy from the matching node associated with the alternative matching subject category identifier to a parent node...”

Therefore, claim 19 is also patentable over the applied references for at the least the same reasons discussed previously. The dependent claims incorporate all the limitations of their respective base claims and are patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of rejection under 35 USC § 103(a).

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-3, 9, 14-15, and 19-24, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them. In addition, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
Roberto Licon, et al.

Date: November 2, 2007

By: /Jason E. Amsel/

Jason Amsel, Patent Agent
Registration No. 60,650
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7692
Fax: (650) 938-5200

24207/10451/DOCS/1795454.2